

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/747,571	LINES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(3) _____.

(2) Robert Fieseler (Applicant's attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 March 2004

Time: 11:30 am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

potential rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph

Claims discussed:

1-20

Prior art documents discussed:

the prior art of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner sent proposed amendments necessary to place the application in condition for allowance to the applicant's attorney for review and approval on March 25, 2004 (see attached). The examiner stipulated that the changes to claim 1 were necessary to better clarify the claim and to eliminate potential rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. The examiner further stipulated that the changes to claim 13 were necessary to better clarify the claim, to eliminate potential rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and to better distinguish the applicant's claimed invention over the prior art of record. The examiner finally stipulated that the changes to the title, the abstract, and the specification were necessary to correct minor informalities, to update the status of related parent applications, and to better make them conform to the format set forth in the MPEP. On March 26, 2004, the applicant's attorney approved the proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment. The examiner and the applicant's attorney also agreed to make claim 4 dependent on claim 3 rather than claim 1 to provide proper antecedent basis. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.